

lines 37-50 of the '350 patent. See also Example 1 on page 23 of the present specification.

Accordingly, since the term "Si/Al ratio" is well understood by those of ordinary skill in the art, applicants respectfully request that the §112, second paragraph rejection of claims 1, 2, 4, 11 and 13 be reconsidered and withdrawn.

2. Claims 1-6 and 11-14 were rejected under 35 USC §103(a) over Toyota (113:102645 CA) and Eberly, Jr. et al. This ground of rejection is respectfully traversed for the following reasons.

The present invention is directed to an adsorbent for purifying automobile exhaust gas. The adsorbent comprises (a) a high-silica zeolite having a Si/Al ratio of not less than 40, and (b) a heat-resistant oxide other than zeolite, wherein the heat-resistant oxide is loaded with a noble metal.

Toyota discloses a layered structure of zeolite,  $\text{Al}_2\text{O}_3$ , and noble metal disposed on a honeycomb support. Toyota, however, fails to disclose a zeolite Si/Al ratio in accordance with the presently claimed invention. Indeed, the Toyota reference fails even to teach any significance to any Si/Al ratio.

The Office Action relied on Eberly et al. for disclosure of such Si/Al ratios in a zeolite material. Eberly et al. disclose zeolite having silica to alumina mole ratios higher than had been previously obtainable. The object of Eberly et al. is to form a high silica content crystalline zeolite molecular sieve. Eberly et al. is not directed to automobile exhaust gas treatment.

Thus, while Eberly et al. disclose zeolite having a Si/Al ratio greater than the claimed minimum ratio of 40, there is no motivation in either of Eberly et al. or Toyota to combine those two references. Toyota fails to teach any significance with respect to a Si/Al ratio of zeolite. And, Eberly is not related to purifying automotive exhaust gases. Thus, one of ordinary skill in the art would not have been motivated to combine the teaching of Eberly et al. with Toyota as asserted in the Office Action, absent the unique teaching of applicants' present disclosure.

For at least the foregoing reasons, applicants respectfully request that the §103(a) rejection of claims 1-6 and 11-14 be reconsidered and withdrawn.

In view of the above, all of the claims in this case are believed to be in condition for allowance. Should the Examiner deem that any further action by the applicants would be desirable in placing this application in even better condition for issue, she is requested to telephone applicants' representatives.

Respectfully submitted,

PARKHURST & WENDEL, L.L.P.

2/18/98  
Date

RWP:LDE/ak

Attorney Docket No.: WATK:040E  
PARKHURST & WENDEL, L.L.P.  
1421 Prince Street, Suite 210  
Alexandria, Virginia 22314-2805  
Telephone: (703) 739-0220

Lawrence D. Eisen  
Roger W. Parkhurst  
Registration No. 25,177  
Lawrence D. Eisen  
Registration No. 41,009